

DRAFT



**SCOTTSDALE DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD
KIVA - CITY HALL
3939 N. DRINKWATER BOULEVARD
JULY 10, 2003
MINUTES**

PRESENT: Wayne Ecton, Council Member
E.L. Cortez, Vice Chairman
David Gulino, Planning Commission Member
Anne Gale, Development Member
Jeremy Jones, Design Member
Michael D'Andrea, Development Member
Michael Schmitt, Design Member

STAFF: Suzanne Colver
Tim Conner
Scott Hamilton
Roger Klingler
Curtis Kozall
Tim Curtis
Randy Grant
Bill Peifer
Jayna Shewak
Marek Ubanek
Bill Verschuren
Al Ward
Dan Walsh
Kira Wauwie
Greg Williams

CALL TO ORDER

The regular meeting of the Scottsdale Development Review Board was called to order by Councilman Ecton at 1:25 p.m.

DRAFT

ROLL CALL

A formal roll call confirmed members present as stated above.

OPENING STATEMENT

COUNCILMAN ECTON read the opening statement that describes the role of the Development Review Board and the procedures used in conducting this meeting.

MINUTES APPROVAL

June 19, 2003 Development Review Board Minutes

VICE CHAIRMAN CORTEZ MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE JUNE 19, 2003 MINUTES AS PRESENTED. SECOND BY MR. JONES.

THE MOTION PASSED BY A VOTE OF SEVEN (7) TO ZERO (0).

CONTINUANCES

89-DR- 1999#2	Monarch Resort Site Plan & Elevations 7171 N. Scottsdale Road Todd & Associates, Architect/Designer
3-MS-2003	Lund Cadillac Master Sign Plan SEC Loop 101 & Scottsdale Road Perspective Architecture, Architect/Designer
44-DR-2003	Lund Cadillac Site Plan & Elevations SEC Loop 101 & Scottsdale Road Perspective Architecture, Architect/Designer

CONSENT AGENDA

COUNCILMAN ECTON stated cases 12-DR-1997#3, 31-DR-2003, 42-DR-2003 and 43-DR-2003 have been moved from consent agenda to the regular agenda.

14-PP-2003	Boulders Preliminary Plat Southeast corner of Black Mountain & Hayden Roads
------------	---

DRAFT

Primas & Associates, Engineers

15-PP-2003
Whisper Rock Unit 5 Preliminary Plat
Dove Valley Alignment, Between the
Hayden Rd Alignment & Leaning Rock Road
Tornow Design Associates
Architect/Designer

18-DR-2001#2
Scottsdale Corporate Center Phase 1
Site plan & elevations
South of the SWC of Pima & Bell Roads
Kendall / Heaton Assoc., Inc.,
Architect/Designer

66-DR-2002#2
Chaparral Water Treatment Plant
Colors & Metal Grill Work
8111 E. McDonald Dr.
Swaback Partners PLLC,
Architect/Designer

23-DR-2003
Clubhouse @ Golf Club Scottsdale
Site plan & elevations
Between Dynamite Rd & Dixileta Drive,
and between 122nd St. & 126th St. alignments
Zehreli & Associates, Architect/Designer

(MR. GULINO DECLARED A CONFLICT ON CASE 23-DR-2003 AND DID NOT PARTICIPATE IN THE VOTE.)

27-DR-2003
Civic Center Office Condos
Site Plan & Elevations
3193 N. Drinkwater Blvd.
Archicon Designers Developers,
Architect/Designer

38-DR-2003
DBL at First Scottsdale
Site plan & elevations
16742 N. 94th Street
DFD Cornoyer Hedrick
Architect/Designer

41-DR-2003
WestWorld Design Guidelines
WestWorld Master Plan Update
16601 N. Pima Rd
City of Scottsdale, Applicant

8-PP-2002#2

Terassina
Preliminary Plat Revision
NEC of 132nd St. & Via Linda
Deacetis Francis Custom Homes Inc.,
Applicant

(MR. GULINO DECLARED A CONFLICT ON CASE 8-PP-2002#2 AND DID NOT PARTICIPATE IN THE VOTE.)

VICE CHAIRMAN CORTEZ MOVED TO APPROVE CASE 14-PP-2003 WITH THE ATTACHED STIPULATIONS AND THE ADDITIONAL STIPULATION THAT THE SITE WALL DESIGN RETURN TO THE DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD FOR REVIEW AND APPROVAL. CASE 15-PP-2003 WITH THE AMENDED STIPULATIONS. CASES 18-DR-2001#2, 66-DR-2002#2, 27-DR-2003 AND 41-DR-2003. SECOND BY MR. SCHMITT.

THE MOTION PASSED BY A VOTE OF SEVEN (7) TO ZERO (0).

MS. SHEWAK inquired if the Board wished to move case 38-DR-2003 to the regular agenda or keep it on the consent. Councilman Ecton stated it was an oversight so they would need a separate motion.

VICE CHAIRMAN CORTEZ MOVED TO APPROVE CASE 38-DR-2003 WITH THE ATTACHED STIPULATIONS. SECOND BY MR. JONES.

THE MOTION PASSED BY A VOTE OF SEVEN (7) TO ZERO (0).

VICE CHAIRMAN CORTEZ MOVED TO APPROVE CASE 23-DR-2003 WITH THE ATTACHED STIPULATIONS AND CASE 8-PP-2002#2 WITH THE ATTACHED STIPULATIONS.

THE MOTION PASSED BY A VOTE OF SIX (6) TO ZERO (0) WITH MR. GULINO ABSTAINING.

REGULAR AGENDA

12-DR-1997#3

Scottsdale Road Bridge Improvements
Scottsdale Road, South of McCormick
Parkway
City of Scottsdale Applicant

MS. SHEWAK presented this case as per the project coordination packet. She stated staff received an email from Cheney Estates neighborhood expressing their concerns regarding the festoon lighting and the poles. They felt the poles

defeat the purpose of the under grounding of the utilities. Staff recommends approval subject to the attached stipulations.

(COUNCILMAN ECTON OPENED PUBLIC TESTIMONY.)

MARY HAMWAY, 7112 E. Bronco Drive, Town of Paradise Valley, AZ, representing Cheney Estates, stated the Town of Paradise Valley would be greatly affected by the decisions the Board makes today. She further stated they do not wish to delay the construction. They do not object to the use of con-arches on the under structure. She remarked that the above road design is such a departure from the original plan that they had to speak up. In an effort to keep this stretch of road free of utility lines the Town of Paradise Valley contributed one million dollars toward the cost to underground the utilities. The poles on the bridge would defeat the purpose of under grounding the utility poles. She further remarked that it seems garish and out of place to use festoon lighting and large banners. She reported they do not wish to delay construction and they would propose splitting the proposed design into two and allowing for construction of the under structure and allowing for the architect to come up with a road design that is compatible with the area. She concluded they want to be good neighbors but this bridge would affect their quality of life and the value of their homes.

VIRGINIA SIMPSON, 6022 N. 51st Place, Town of Paradise Valley, AZ, stated she is here on behalf of the Town of Paradise Valley. She further stated they are very proud of their partnership with the City of Scottsdale in under grounding and widening of the entire band of Scottsdale Road. She remarked here is an opportunity to make a statement at the entrance into south Scottsdale. They are concerned about the design being used above ground. She further remarked they are concerned about the visual impact. She commented she went out and took some pictures and discussed her concerns with the proposed design. She further commented this is a copy of the Mill Avenue Bridge and does not fit in with the western character of the city. They are concerned about their views of the mountains being blocked by the decorative sails proposed to be on the bridge. She noted she felt the need to rethink the design of the above ground portion of the bridge.

VIRGINIA HAVERMALE, 7248 E. Harmont Drive, stated she was appalled to see this design because she thought they were getting rid of the telephone lines and all this garbage in the sky and here what they see is a circus. She remarked she would agree with the previous two speakers.

(COUNCILMAN ECTON CLOSED PUBLIC TESTIMONY.)

MR. GULINO stated this is not a bad design but it does not fit this location. He further stated the sails and lights don't work. He noted his only concern is with what is going on above the deck.

MR. JONES stated there has been a lot of progress made in developing the colors on the lower part of the bridge. He further stated this design gives the impression they are copying one of the neighbors and that is unfortunate at best. This design would provide a lot of light at night and probably be part of the night sky problem they are having. He stated with regard to the sails he could go either way on but he would agree it is not a desert solution. He commented he liked the bridge from the rail down and felt it would still be a great bridge without anything else.

MS. GALE stated she felt the colors need tremendous reconsideration. She further stated the sails in the desert are clever but that is what they are clever. She commented she reflects on the experience she has driving over the Deck Park Bridge in downtown where they have the elegant light posts that do come up above the base of the bridge so you have something to enjoy as you go across. It is pleasurable. It feels dignified and important. They don't accomplish that with sails, which refer to another genre of thinking. She noted she would like them to reconsider two things what happens above the bridge and the colors of the bridge. She further noted the base of the bridge is fine.

MS. SHEWAK commented she did meet with staff before the meeting and if it is the Board's desire today to delete the festoon lighting along with the polls and the sails staff is okay with that.

MR. SCHMITT inquired from the staff perspective was there a need for the sails to act as banners. Ms. Shewak replied it was just an opportunity to get something a little bit different on those poles.

Mr. Schmitt commented he was unaware of the effort and money that was utilized to underground the power lines and do things in that area. He further commented he would be in favor of doing something different than the festoon lights. He remarked he would not necessarily say they could not have vertical elements. They could do some sort of element with architectural light fixture on it to achieve the same means and make it a special bridge similar to what Ms. Gale described in downtown Phoenix because that is an exciting and interesting bridge going down Central Avenue. He added he would support something in that direction.

MS. SHEWAK stated she just spoke with Dan Walsh to see if they can continue to work on those vertical elements. They would need to return quickly with a solution because the conduit for the lighting is going in with the super structure on the bridges. She reiterated they would need to come back quickly and allow staff approval after the Board has given them specific directions.

MR. D'ANDREA stated he thought the vertical elements could be something nicely done. He further stated it would be nice to see dimensions for this bridge and nice to see the levels from which houses are viewing the bridge.

COUNCILMAN ECTON stated his first reaction was when he saw the renderings was that they took down poles and put up polls with wires on them. He further stated he did not like that. He inquired about the height of the vertical poles. Ms. Shewak stated 18 feet. Councilman Ecton stated he did not think they needed an 18-foot poll there. He further stated if he were a neighbor regardless of how attractive it might be that would not be appealing. He noted he felt some sort of vertical element is desirable and they would make it very attractive but it needs to be scaled down.

VICE CHAIRMAN CORTEZ inquired about the timing for this project. Mr. Walsh reviewed the timing for this project noting the portion of the above bridge that includes the lights is probably six months down the road. He stated the festoon lighting and sails could easily be deleted.

JIM LARSON, Larson Associates Architects, stated the only thing that is integral is that the current construction process provide conduits for the pedestrian lighting needed on the bridge.

VICE CHAIRMAN CORTEZ asked Mr. Larson based on the public testimony and what he has heard from the Board if he would be willing to take a look at the colors and reconsider the festoon lighting and vertical elements of this bridge. Mr. Larson stated he would not have a problem returning to the original color palette. He further stated he would have thought they would have lost the festoon lighting a long time ago.

Vice Chairman Cortez stated it would appear that the original design that was presented to the Board and approved indicated more of a pedestrian scale element in the trellis and that was eliminated with the second rendition. He inquired if there was any history on that. Mr. Larson stated the trellis is 14 feet high and the trellis elements were widely spaced and ran north and south direction and were purely decoration. It was very difficult to integrate lighting. They abandoned the idea because there was not a way to make it work architecturally or functionally.

MS. SHEWAK stated the Capital Project staff is very concerned about the timing and getting the bridge built. She further stated that because of the major concerns about the festoon lighting, the pole lights, and the sails they do not need to be on this bridge. She remarked what is important is the articulation of the columns and railing design et cetera, but staff does not have a strong feeling about the festoon lighting as a major design element. She further stated at this point given all the issues that have been raised here and some issues associated

with the under grounding of the power poles those elements should be deleted in favor of maintaining the view corridors and build the bridge as presented minus those elements. They could continue to look at the pedestrian lighting at a much lower scale and resolve those issues at the staff level.

COUNCILMAN ECTON stated he would concur with that idea.

MS. GALE stated it would be dreadful to give up the possibility of an elegant bridge and to just wipe it off because they don't like what was presented. She further stated they need an important entrance to their community and she would be sad if there were nothing. They need something decorative on the bridge.

COUNCILMAN ECTON stated he did not interpret it that way. It was his understanding that they would go ahead with the bridge and take another look at what to do on top. Ms. Shewak replied that was the intent and to allow it to be resolved at the staff level.

ROGER KLINGLER, Assistant City Manager, stated he wanted to emphasize as the applicant in this case they do need to have the bridge built. He further stated they do want it to be a nice bridge. They don't need the sails. They don't need the festoon lights. Those elements are not critical to getting it build.

COUNCILMAN ECTON stated he felt they should move ahead building the bridge and have the lighting ability but ask staff to do further work on developing the upper part of the bridge in accordance with Ms. Gale's suggestions.

MR. JONES MOVED TO APPROVE CASE 12-DR-1997#3 THAT THEY APPROVE THE BASE STRUCTURE OF THE BRIDGE FROM THE RAIL DOWN. THAT THEY HAVE THE ARCHITECT RE-EVALUATE ELEMENTS ABOVE THE HANDRAIL AND INTEGRATE THEM WITH THE LIGHTING. THAT THE ARCHITECT FURTHER REVIEW THE COLORS POSSIBLY GOING BACK TO WHERE HE WAS IN THE LAST PHASE. SECOND BY MR. SCHMITT.

THE MOTION PASSED BY A VOTE OF SEVEN (7) TO ZERO (0).

42-DR-2003

Scottsdale Association of Realtors
Site plan & elevations
4221 N. Scottsdale Rd
Bollinger & Cardenas Architects,
Applicant.

MS. WAUWIE presented this case as per the project coordination packet. Ms. Wauwie stated during the study session there were questions regarding the mixture of colors on the façade of the building. She reported after the study

session she checked with the applicant and discussed whether those changes could be made. She further reported they are willing to go back and restudy the application of the colors to ensure a better mixture as well as to ensure there is a mix of colors along those elevations that are currently shown as monochromatic.

Staff recommends approval subject to the attached stipulations.

MS. GALE stated as long as they have the applicant looking at more interesting colors they should look at the courtyard area because she felt more could happen with the building to break up the monotony of the wall.

MR. GULINO MOVED TO APPROVE CASE 42-DR-2003 WITH THE ADDED STIPULATION THAT THE APPLICANT WORK WITH STAFF AND WITH STAFF APPROVAL TO BREAK UP THE MONOTONY OF THE SOUTH WALL AND INTRODUCE MORE INTERESTING COLORS IN THE COURTYARD. SECOND BY VICE CHAIRMAN CORTEZ.

THE MOTION PASSED BY A VOTE OF SEVEN (7) TO ZERO (0).

31-DR-2003

Ironwood Courtyard
Site plan & Elevations
E Ironwood Square Dr/N 96th St 9NW)
DFD CornoyerHedrick,
Architect/Designer

MR. VERSCHUREN presented this case as per the project coordination packet. Staff recommends approval subject to the attached stipulations.

MR. SCHMITT stated he would suggest they shift the buildings on the north to allow for double loaded parking on the south side of the building and the opportunity for higher mass landscaping.

MR. SCHMITT MOVED TO APPROVE CASE 31-DR-2003 WITH THE ATTACHED STIPULATIONS AND THE FOLLOWING ADDED STIPULATION:

THE BUILDINGS BE SHIFTED TO THE NORTH ALLOWING DOUBLE LOADED PARKING ON THE SOUTH SIDE OF THE BUILDINGS AND THE OPPORTUNITY TO PROVIDE HIGHER MASS LANDSCAPING ON THAT SIDE OF THE BUILDING.

SECOND BY MR. JONES.

MR. VERSCHUREN inquired about placing a stipulation on the size of the tree or the amount of parking spaces that should be taken away. Mr. Schmitt inquired

about the size that is specified for the larger landscape trees. Mr. Verschuren stated they have a variety of 48-inch box, 24-inch box, and 36-inch box.

MR. SCHMITT stated he would suggest the trees planted on the south side of the building are 36-inch box that would be given an opportunity to grow in a short period of time and fulfill the need they have there. The number could be worked out with the staff and the applicant to come to the appropriate balance of trees and parking.

THE MOTION PASSED BY A VOTE OF SEVEN (7) TO ZERO (0).

43-DR-2003

96th Street Improvements
Improvements on 96th Street from Shea
Blvd. to Redfield
City of Scottsdale, Applicant

MS. WAUWIE presented this case as per the project coordination packet. She stated they are proposing a new stipulation for the color material of the light pole. Staff recommends approval, subject to the attached stipulations.

MR. GULINO inquired if the idea for the round about is to eliminate left turns at Cholla and Sweetwater. Ms. Wauwie replied in the affirmative. She stated people would still be able to do a left-hand maneuver they would just have to go around the turn about.

MR. D'ANDREA inquired if the elements attached to the pole are three-dimensional. He also inquired about the rational behind that element. Ms. Wauwie stated the rational is an identifying feature for the Cactus Corridor. Mr. Ubanek stated the intention was to keep that element flat and not three dimension and not to used on every pole but on the significant poles that are visible.

MR. GULINO requested information on the landscaping plan.

DENNIS PELTZ, McCloskey Peltz Landscape Architects, stated the idea is to spruce up the exiting landscaping. They will be doing in fill planting to supplement the planting that already exists.

MR. GULINO stated the posts in the middle of the turn about look to be a hazard and an accident waiting to happen even if the speed is relatively low. He inquired if there have been any discussions with risk management. Mr. Ubanek stated that those were the recommendations from the transportation department, and it is a speed-mitigating feature.

MS. GALE stated she would like to address the design feature that is represented by the purple cactus. She further stated that this design might not be the direction they want to go. She added she could not support this cactus she would like to see something simpler and more design oriented rather than trying to evoke an element of their southwestern lifestyle. Mr. Ubanek stated they would consider her ideas.

VICE CHAIRMAN CORTEZ stated he does not like the idea that they are adding color to these light poles. He further stated they should not take the additional step of making features of these visual-cluttering elements. He remarked he does not care for the cacti that have been displayed on the light poles and he does not care for the four vertical monuments at the roadway. He further remarked he would concur with Mr. Gulino that there are liability issues. He noted he did not think there was a need for four gateway monuments. He further noted he felt it would be best to take a more simplistic approach to this. He added at the very least they should re-study these design elements but he would be in favor of eliminating them.

(COUNCILMAN ECTON OPENED PUBLIC TESTIMONY.)

SUSAN WHEELER, 9616 E. Kalil, stated they have been studying this area since 1989. When Adams Arabian subdivided and clustered the homes south of the 22 acres of the 32 acres lot parcel they gave money for a monument to go on Cactus Road and 96th Street. It is suppose to be a monument that says you are entering the Cactus Corridor and that it is a unique area. She stated the round about has to be round to accommodate the horse trailers. She remarked it is very important they keep the equestrians in mind when this is designed. She further remarked it is important to keep the wonderful trees. The lights are important and the switches should be up high so you can change the light from on top of a horse.

LIN HAINLEN, 12344 N. 96th Place, stated her horse property backs up to 96th Street between Cactus and Larkspur. She further stated she is concerned with her own property that there is a landscape border because she raises dogs. She remarked she is concerned about the lack of any other fencing going in. The existing chain link fencing does not do much to shade the proposed path. She further remarked she would like to see that the existing landscape stay. There should be landscape that is dense enough that her dogs charging the chain link fence is not a liability to herself, the city, and to people on the proposed trails that will be part of this project.

(COUNCILMAN ECTON CLOSED PUBLIC TESTIMONY.)

MR. SCHMITT requested staff describe the fence condition that was just spoken of. Mr. Ubanek stated for the safety of the horses they decided to move the road

over to the west and there is enough room for the road, the curb, buffer zone, the horse trail, and the existing fence the way it is. He noted they would be planting more plants in this area.

VICE CHAIRMAN CORTEZ MOVED TO APPROVE CASE 43-DR-2003 WITH THE ADDED STIPULATION THAT THE DESIGN ELEMENTS SPECIFICALLY THE STREETLIGHT POLE LOGO, THE ROUND ABOUT MONUMENT, AND THE QUANTITY OF GATEWAY MONUMENTS BE RESTUDIED AND BROUGHT BACK TO THE DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD FOR REVIEW AND APPROVAL. SECOND BY MR. JONES.

THE MOTION PASSED BY A VOTE OF SEVEN (7) TO ZERO (0).

231-DR-1996#12

James Hotel Scottsdale
Site plan & elevations
7353 E. Indian School Road
DLR Group, Architect/Designer

MR. WILLIAMS presented this case as per the project coordination packet. Staff recommends approval subject to the attached stipulations.

VICE CHAIRMAN CORTEZ stated he counted four new entry monuments and was concerned about the one that is located on North Civic Center because of the fact that the applicant has requested that be gated and there will be no public access through the gate. He further stated he is concerned that for all the years that has been a public access and exit that someone comes around the corner seeing the monument sign assuming it is an entry location and there might be an accident. Mr. Williams stated there is a stipulation that the gate would come back for a separate approval because they did not expect a gate and they need to work that out further. They can work the monument into that approval process. He further stated one of the reasons they are bringing that back is they need 75 feet from the back curb in order to create that turn around.

JEFF DAGOWITZ, 206 Spring Street, New York, New York, stated at the study session a few weeks ago they received positive comments. They have worked closely with staff. They also met with the local neighbors who represent Old Town Scottsdale supporters and they responded very positively to the renovations and colors. They wrote a letter in support of the colors. He discussed the letter.

MR. GULINO inquired about the need for the entry monument if they are just going to gate it. Mr. Dagowitz stated the concept is that potentially there would be times when they would need to have traffic go through there. The objective is to have a beautiful entrance on Buckboard and to make that the primary egress and ingress for traffic. Mr. Berry stated on the gate issue if they meet the 75-foot

setback requirement then they would work with staff on putting the gate in. If they can't have a gate because they don't meet the 75-foot requirement then the entry monument makes sense given the historic traffic patterns.

MS. GALE requested information on where each of the colors would be used on the building.

CHRISTI TEN EYCK reviewed how all of the colors would be used on the building.

MR. SCHMITT stated regarding the gate, what is the function of gating the secondary entrance off of North Civic Center Drive? Mr. Dagowitz stated to steer traffic and to really emphasize the main entrance.

Mr. Schmitt inquired about the barrier planting on the dining patio. Mr. Dagowitz stated the concept of the landscape buffer is to minimize someone from reaching over and grabbing a drink, which is part of the requirements of the liquor license, but the patio will be open and interact with the Mall area.

VICE CHAIRMAN CORTEZ inquired if the three additional courses of masonry that will be added will match what exists. Mr. Dagowitz replied in the affirmative.

MR. GULINO MOVED TO APPROVE CASE 231-DR-1996#12 AS PRESENTED. SECOND BY MR. JONES.

THE MOTION PASSED BY A VOTE OF SEVEN (7) TO ZERO (0).

40-DR-2003

Chaparral Park Expansion
Site Plan & Elevations
8111 & 8112 E. McDonald Dr. (NEC & SEC)
McDonald & Hayden
City of Scottsdale, Applicant

MR. WARD presented this case as per the project coordination packet. Staff recommends approval subject to the attached stipulations.

VICE CHAIRMAN CORTEZ inquired if it was the intent to have the city maintain the entire landscape area lawn turf area from the back of curb on north 80th Place. He also inquired about the intent of the reconfiguration of the pond. Mr. Peifer stated the city would be maintaining that parcel. He further stated the lake would have to be rebuilt for irrigation and they will show how much water each citizen in the valley uses. The shape would be a series of steps down.

Vice Chairman Cortez inquired if there would be a walkway around the perimeter of the lake. Ms. Ten Eyck replied in the affirmative. She provided information on

the thoughts behind the configuration of the lake. They are trying to provide information on water usage and how precious it is. Mr. Peifer provided additional information on the materials that would be used on the sidewalk.

Vice Chairman Cortez inquired about the routing of the canal linkage with the water treatment plan. Mr. Peifer stated they are looking at coming down 82nd and Pine and then go into the plant.

MR. GULINO stated if the issues regarding the ball fields have been resolved. Mr. Hamilton replied in the affirmative. Mr. Gulino inquired if the soccer field would be regulation size. Mr. Hamilton stated it would not be regulation size.

MR. SCHMITT stated the portion on the park on the north side by the pond there appears little way to get there the parking lot is quite ways off. He inquired if there has been some consideration given to having some parking off of that street on the east of the park to allow people to have use of that park. Mr. Peifer stated staff looked at other possibilities for that park but the neighbors want to keep it passive so their views are not obstructed. It is connected through an underpass.

VICE CHAIRMAN CORTEZ MOVED TO APPROVE CASE 40-DR-2003 WITH THE ATTACHED STIPULATIONS. SECOND BY MR. JONES.

THE MOTION PASSED BY A VOTE OF SEVEN (7) TO ZERO (0).

ADJOURNMENT

With no further business to discuss, the regular meeting of the Scottsdale Development Review Board was adjourned at 3:40 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted

"For the Record" Court Reporters